

Remarks

Claims 1-11 are pending, with Claims 1 and 2 being independent. Claims 1-7 and 9 have been amended. Claims 12-18 have been canceled without prejudice.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection and objection are respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 2, 3, 4, and 9 are objected to. Claim 2 is objected to because it recites an additional restricting portion that the Examiner believes is merely another function of the abutment portions. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection, since in at least one embodiment, the abutment portions correspond to the projections 10f5 and 10f6, while the additional restricting portions correspond to the projections 10f1a and 10f1b, as discussed on page 35 of the clean version of the substitute specification. Claim 3 is objected to because “the largest of all lengths” is believed to be essentially zero, since the abutment portion of one part and a receiving portion of another part contact each other, making the distance therebetween zero. In response, while not conceding the propriety of the objection, Claim 4, which now recites the features of Claim 3 has been amended to make clear that the abutment and receiving portions are on the same part, so that the distance therebetween is not zero, as discussed, for example, on page 37 of the clean version of the substitute specification, and as shown, for example in Figure 30, where the distance between 8c1 and 8c2 is along the longest portion of the part. Claim 4 is objected to for a minor informality therein and Applicants have amended Claim 5, which now recites the features of Claim 4, to adopt the Examiner’s suggestion for overcoming the objection. Claim 9 has been objected to because it is allegedly inaccurate. In response, while not conceding

the propriety of the objection, Claim 9 has been amended to address the points raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over the patent to Szuba. In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejection, Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of Claim 6, which has not been rejected, and Claim 2 has been redrafted in independent form and to include the features of dependent Claim 7, which has not been rejected, thereby rendering the rejections moot.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs/

Attorney for Applicants
Gary M. Jacobs
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

GMJ

DC_MAIN 257573v1